



# South Carolina Commission on Higher Education

Layton McCurdy, M.D., Chairman  
Mr. Daniel Ravenel, Vice Chairman  
Col. John T. Bowden, Jr.  
Douglas R. Forbes, D.M.D.  
Dr. Bettie Rose Horne  
Dr. Raghu Korrapati  
Dr. Louis B. Lynn  
Ms. Cynthia C. Mosteller  
Mr. James R. Sanders  
Mr. Hood Temple  
Mr. Kenneth B. Wingate  
Mr. Randy Thomas  
Mr. Neal J. Workman, Jr.  
Dr. Mitchell Zais

CAAL  
04/03/2008  
Agenda Item 6

Dr. Garrison Walters, Executive Director

April 3, 2008

## **MEMORANDUM**

**To:** Dr. Bettie Rose Horne, Chair, and Members of the Committee on Academic Affairs and Licensing

**From:** Dr. Gail M. Morrison, Director of Academic Affairs and Licensing

### **Consideration of Awards for Centers of Excellence (Teacher Education)** **Competitive Grants Program, FY 2008-09** **(New and Continuing)**

## **Background**

Requests for Proposals for Centers of Excellence for the FY 2008-09 project year were issued to all eligible public and private institutions in September 1, 2007. At the request of the Education Oversight Committee, proposals were requested that focus on literacy in adolescent education. Three proposals were received for consideration:

- ❖ Clemson University  
Center of Excellence for Inquiry in Mathematics and Science (CEIMS)
- ❖ University of South Carolina – Upstate  
Center of Excellence in Mathematics and Science Teaching at the Middle Level (CE-MAST)
- ❖ University of South Carolina – Columbia  
Center of Educational Equity in Mathematics and Science (CEEMS)

A Review Panel (**Attachment 1**), consisting of one representative from the Department of Education, one representative from the Middle Level Teacher Education Initiative, two representatives from private institutions, two representatives from public

institutions, one representative from a public middle school, and one staff member from the Commission on Higher Education, was appointed to review the proposals and to make recommendations. The Panel Report is attached (**Attachment 2**). The Panel was chaired by Dr. Ronald Joekel, a professor from the University of Nebraska. Abstracts for the three proposed Centers are also attached (**Attachment 3**).

## **Discussion**

The Review Panel met on March 7, 2008, to receive presentations from the representatives from each institution and discuss the merits of each proposed center. The panel's recommendation is to fund the proposed center from Clemson University. The panel members conducted a lengthy discussion about the proposals and concluded that the proposed center from Clemson University rated the highest in the panel's discussion. The purpose of the Center of Excellence for Inquiry in Mathematics and Science (CEIMS) is to prepare teachers to engage middle school students in meaningful and thoughtful inquiry-based instruction. CEIMS will establish exemplary pathways at Clemson University to prepare middle school mathematics and science teachers for certification; these pathways, individually and collectively, will not only address the shortage of teachers but will also serve as models that can be duplicated through the state and nation. The Center will work with partner middle schools (Beck Academy, Hughes Academy, and Seneca Middle School) to improve the content and pedagogical abilities of currently practicing middle school mathematics and science teachers. Through professional development institutes that provide on-going support, these experienced teachers will be prepared to improve the achievement of their middle school students; furthermore, they will be prepared to serve as mentors to Clemson pre-service teachers, providing them with rich and diverse field experiences.

The proposed centers from USC-Columbia and USC-Upstate had salient features and potential, but the panel was charged with selecting one proposal it felt had the most promise to fulfill the purpose of the *Center of Excellence Program Guidelines* and to improve the content knowledge in mathematics and science of middle level students and teachers. In FY 2007-08, the S.C. General Assembly approved the Commission's request for an appropriation of \$721,101. With five centers in the second, third, and fourth years of funding (**Attachment 4**), funding is available for only one new Center for FY 2008-09, contingent upon the availability of funds.

The proposed center from USC-Upstate, a Center of Excellence in Mathematics and Science Teaching in the Middle Level, was strongly considered for funding. The purpose of the center was to improve math and science teaching in the middle grades that will serve as a "state-of-the-art" resource center for the improvement of middle level mathematics and science instruction. The proposal had a strong middle level focus that used research-based curriculum materials with mathematics and science. The proposal

lacked a clear dissemination plan that would allow it to become a model for the state and contained a weak evaluation plan. The review panel expressed concerns about the ability to have the appropriate number of faculty work with this Center at USC-Sumter and the identified schools.

The proposed Center of Equity in Mathematics and Science from the University of South Carolina-Columbia also was evaluated as having potential for funding. The Center's purpose is a two-prong approach that focuses on professional development and research and evaluation. The proposed center would focus on professional development that emphasizes three strands: 1) content knowledge and instructional skills for preservice teachers, 2) professional development for inservice teachers, and 3) efforts aimed at increasing the number of certified mathematics and science teachers in South Carolina middle schools. The review panel expressed concern that the budget was heavily weighted towards salaries. The panel would like to have seen a clearer, specific focus on middle level mathematics and science and evidence of collaboration with other Centers of Excellence. The panel was pleased that USC-Columbia did collaborate with the South Carolina Department of Education Office of Curriculum Standards.

The non-funded project proposals have been referred to the Commission's *Improving Teacher Quality Competitive Grants Program*. The institutions proposing these projects have been urged either to adapt their proposals to the requirements of that program and submit them for funding or to revise the proposals and resubmit them to next year's Center of Excellence (Education) competition.

### **Recommendation**

In keeping with authority previously delegated to it by the Commission, the staff recommends that the Committee on Academic Affairs and Licensing accept the Review Panel's recommendation and approve a new award to Clemson University to establish the Center of Excellence for Inquiry in Mathematics and Science (CEIMS) in the amount of \$150,000, pending submission of 1) a revised budget; 2) a plan of action to involve poverty schools outside of Greenville County in the activities; and 3) evidence of collaboration with the South Carolina Department of Education Office of Mathematics and Science Curriculum Standards to incorporate current initiatives in the center activities.

The staff recommends that the Committee on Academic Affairs and Licensing accept the staff's recommendation and approve continued funding for Clemson University, College of Charleston, Francis Marion University, University of South Carolina-Beaufort, and University of South Carolina-Aiken pending submission of a formal budget request for FY 2008-09 and a final report for FY 2007-08.

|                      |  |
|----------------------|--|
| <b>Attachment 1:</b> | Review Panel Members                     |
| <b>Attachment 2:</b> | Report of the Review Panel               |
| <b>Attachment 3:</b> | Proposal Abstracts                       |
| <b>Attachment 4:</b> | Continuing Centers of Excellence         |
| <b>Attachment 5:</b> | Centers of Excellence Rubric/Rating Form |
| <b>Attachment 6:</b> | Review Panel Agenda                      |

**Centers of Excellence  
FY 2007-2008  
Review Panel Members**

***Dr. Ronald Joekel – Chair***

Professor Educational Administration &  
Higher Education  
University of Nebraska

***Dr. Fred Splittgerber***

Middle Level Teacher Education  
Initiative  
Grant Coordinator

***Mark A. Bounds***

Deputy Superintendent  
Division of Educator Quality and  
Leadership  
South Carolina Department of Education

***Dr. Nieves McNulty***

Chair, Mathematics Department  
Columbia College

***Dr. Cindy Johnson-Taylor***

Newberry College  
Dean, Teacher Education Program

***Dr. Frank Pullano***

Associate Professor of Mathematics  
Winthrop University

***Dr. Jeff Lee***

Associate Dean, School of Education  
Francis Marion University

***Ms. Suzanne Presnell***

7<sup>th</sup> grade Mathematics Teacher  
Pelion Middle School

***Ms. Renea Eshleman***

Program Manager, Academic Affairs  
CHE

**Staff Support:**

***Dr. Paula Gregg***

Program Manager  
Academic Affairs and Licensing  
Commission on Higher Education

**REPORT OF THE REVIEW PANEL**  
**SOUTH CAROLINA COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION**  
**CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE PROGRAMS**  
**EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1984**

**Focus on Mathematics and  
Science in the middle schools**

**March 14, 2008**

**PROJECT YEAR 2008-2009**

The South Carolina Commission on Higher Education appointed a Panel to review proposals submitted to the Commission for the establishment of Centers of Excellence for the Fiscal Year 2008-2009. The Panel met on March 7, 2008, at the Commission Office in Columbia, South Carolina to review colleges and universities that had submitted proposals to the Commission and to make recommendations to the Commission about the disposition of the proposals.

In advance of the meeting, members of the Review Panel were sent the *Guidelines for Submission of Proposals –Centers of Excellence Education Improvement Act of 1984*, three proposals that had been submitted by colleges and universities for consideration for the project year 2008-2009. Members were asked to read and acquaint themselves with the Guidelines and the three proposals prior to the March 7, 2008 meeting. Panel members were asked to complete a Proposal Review Rubric/Rating Form for each of the three proposals.

The panel recognizes the substantial effort and institutional commitment that goes into conceptualizing, developing, and writing proposals following the Commission's guidelines. The three institutions submitting proposals are to be congratulated for undertaking this task and creating proposals to enhance the education for students in South Carolina Schools.

In addition to reading the proposals prior to the March 7 meeting, panel members conducted interviews with teams representing each of the three institutions submitting proposals. The teams were comprised of administration/faculty/ from the institutions of higher education and in most cases, representatives from the K-12 schools who were partners identified in the proposal.

A schedule was developed whereby the proposal team was assigned one hour to make a presentation on their proposal and answer question questions from panel members. Following the interviews, the panel discussed each proposal at some lengths identifying the strengths of each

proposal as well as any areas of concern. All three of the proposals were immediately identified as having potential for the improvement of instruction and education at the middle school level.

The three proposals and their titles presented in alphabetical order were:

|  |  |
|--|--|
| University of South Carolina               | Center for Educational Equity in Mathematics and Science (CEEMS) |
| University of South Carolina (USC Upstate) | Center of Excellence in Mathematics and Science (CE-MAST)        |
| Clemson University                         | Center of Excellence for Inquiry in Mathematics and Science      |

All three proposals had salient features and potential, but the committee was charged with selecting the one proposal they felt had the most promise to fulfill the purpose of the Center of Excellence Program Guideline and improving the literacy/reading of middle level students.

## RECOMMENDATION

The panel recommends funding for the Clemson University proposal titled, Center for Inquiry in Mathematics and Science (CEIMS). The Center's purpose and focus will be to prepare teachers who will engage middle school students in meaningful and thoughtful-inquiry based instruction. The Center will establish exemplary pathways at Clemson University to prepare middle level school mathematics and science teachers for certification. These pathways, individually and collectively, will not only address the shortage of teachers but will also serve as models that can be replicated throughout the state. The Center will work with partner schools to improve the content and pedagogical abilities of currently practicing middle school mathematics and science teachers. Through Professional Development Institutes that provide ongoing support, these experienced teachers will be prepared to improve the achievement of their middle school students. They will also be prepared to serve as mentors to Clemson pre-service students providing them with rich and diverse field experiences.

The Center will immerse, prepare, and support participants in the implementation of an innovative and research-based instructional model for content-embedded inquiry. Content-imbedded inquiry is a pedagogical strategy that unites standards-based content with inquiry-based learning. This combination is integral to the vision conveyed in both the *National Science Education Standards* (National Research Council, 1996) and the *Principles and Standards for School Mathematics* (National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, 2000).

### Primary Goals:

Two primary goals with a series of objectives for each goal will guide work of the Center:

Goal 1: Increase the number of highly qualified middle school mathematics and science teachers;

Goal 2: Increase the quality, confidence and competence of in-service middle school mathematics and science teachers through the use of content-embedded inquiry.

To accomplish goal one, CEIMS will develop a **new** undergraduate middle school program, increase the number of teachers in the current M.A.T. program for middle grades, modify existing programs so that elementary and secondary school teachers can obtain middle school certification.

To accomplish goal two, CEIMS will offer two levels of Professional Development Institutes which will give provide in-service to middle school math and science teachers. Extensive and intensive experiences will be offered that will increase teacher's content knowledge and improve their pedagogical skills.

Content-embedded inquiry will be the focus of both the programs and Institutes. As teachers become better equipped to implement mathematical problem-solving and scientific experimentation in their classrooms, students will learn in greater depth. The new instructional strategies will emphasize student engagement in learning over lecture and formula-driven strategies that are pervasive in most middle school math and science classrooms.

One of the impressive aspects of the CEIMS proposal was the fact that it is based on a model called 4E X 2 Instruction that has been developed, implemented, researched and found to be effective. The 4E by 2 model integrates *assessment* and *reflection* with the 4E's of *Engage, Explore, Explain, Extend*. The model provides a strong framework leading to inquiry instruction. The *assessment* utilized in this model list primarily formative assessment, not just summative assessment. The addition of *student reflection* calls for students to examine their strategies and knowledge in problem solving.

The Professional Development Institutes will allow teachers to experience content-embedded inquiry and then guide them as they develop, pilot, and improve *Unit* and *Lesson Exemplars* targeted at middle school math and science standards. Evaluation and research will be conducted to monitor and improve the processes undertaken by the Center. As a result of the Center, 20 Unit Exemplars (approximately 140 days of instruction) and Lesson Exemplars will be created and made available to middle school math and science teachers throughout South Carolina. These exemplars will be stored in a web-based tool developed in conjunction with the Center.

Collaborative planning in the development of the proposal has grown out of the Inquiry in Motion project that originated the summer of 2007. As a result, it is evident there is a strong commitment from Clemson University and the School District of Greenville County. Partnership agreements have been signed with Beck Academy, Hughes Academy, and Seneca Middle School. Administrators from these schools have agreed to encourage active participation on the



part of their teachers. The teachers will also become mentors to Clemson students enrolled in pre-service middle school teaching programs.

### **SUMMARY:**

The Review Panel felt the goals, objectives and activities outlined by the proposal offer great potential for improving mathematics and science in the middle school. It addresses both pre-service and in-service needs with a solid model (4 E X 2) that has been demonstrated to work elsewhere. The Center will have good leadership from Professors Horton and Marshall as co-directors. Clemson University and the partner schools have committed to the proposal and it should be an interesting project.

### **Recommendation to CEIMS**

The panel encourages seeking collaboration with other schools outside of Greenville and to work closely with the State Department of Education in the implementation of the two goals and in dissemination of products developed by the Center.

### **OTHER PROPOSALS**

Two additional proposals were submitted and each had admirable features. We encourage the proposal developers to not cast aside their proposals, but work diligently to implement parts of their proposal that are feasible.

#### **University of South Carolina Upstate Center of Excellence in Mathematics & Science Teaching at the Middle Level**

The University of South Carolina Upstate working collaboratively with Sumter County School District 2 put together a proposal called CE-MAST (Center of Excellence in Mathematics and Science Teaching at the Middle Level). The said purpose of the Center was to improve math and science teaching in the middle grades serving as a “state-of-the-art” resource center. CE-Mast proposed to develop and model state-of-the-art teacher education programs, conduct research related to effective math and science instruction and position itself as a leader in the state through the dissemination of information to benefit others involved in middle level teacher education.

The target population for the Center will be teachers and students of Sumter 2 School District. Specifically, the low performing schools identified by the CHE 2005 Report Card Rating and Poverty Index for South Carolina will be targeted. Pre-service students at USC Upstate striving to become certified teachers will also be served. CE-MAST will conduct in-service workshops in content and pedagogy, create and implement pre-service, undergraduate standards-based content and methods courses. Additionally, it will offer necessary coursework for add-on-middle grades certification.

The expected outcome of the Center and its multiple activities is that middle level teachers in Sumter will become more effective in math and science instruction, middle grade students will achieve at a higher level in math and science, pre-service education of middle level teachers will be improved and the number of middle level certified teachers will increase.

One of the strengths of the proposal was the degree of collaboration that had taken place in the development of the proposal. It was also good to see that Greenville Technical College and the Center of Excellence for Educational Technology at USC Aiken were partners in the proposal.

Although there is a need for programs to work with very poor schools, the panel felt the proposal was too vague in many cases. For example, when they state they will develop and model state-of-the art teacher education programs, which is easy to state but do they have the resources and capability to do this? Goal 2 says they will conduct relevant research, a noble goal, but creating an advisory board and doing a literature review is much different than actually conducting research! And for Goal three, “establish a position of leadership in the state.” Again a noble goal but creating a website, presenting at state conferences and starting a conference is something that other institutions are doing as well and hardly makes one a leader in the state.

The proposal also suffered from a lack of measurable outcomes, and the external evaluation and data analysis were weak.

### **University of South Carolina Center of Educational Equity in Mathematics & Science (CEEMS)**

The University of South Carolina responding to the needs of low performing middle level schools in their area proposed creating the Center of Educational Equity in Mathematics and Science (CEEMS). A two pronged approach focusing on: 1) professional development; and 2) research and evaluation is at the heart of the Center. The professional development focus will aim to improve the content knowledge and instructional skills of both pre-service and in-service teachers. Building on an existing middle level teacher education program at USC and professional development agendas that participating school districts have developed, the professional development goal emphasizes three strands: 1) content knowledge and instructional skills for pre-service teachers; 2) professional development for in-service teachers; and 3) efforts aimed at increasing the number of certified mathematics and science teachers in South Carolina middle schools. All three strands will have a strong focus on equity issues, culturally relevant pedagogical content knowledge, and inquiry. The second component of the Center’s purpose, research and evaluation will feature collaboration with school partners to evaluate student and teacher outcomes of the professional development. The proposal also calls for a statewide needs assessment of low performing schools in the state.

CEEMS strategy focused on four key activities during the first two years: 1) three partnerships with schools, 2) graduate and undergraduate coursework, 3) teacher recruitment and retention; and 4) needs assessment of partner schools and other low performing schools statewide. After developing and refining these efforts, CEEMS activities will expand to respond to the needs of a broader selection of low performing schools in South Carolina during the last three years of the project. Technology, including online distance education will be utilized to share information and exemplarily protocols with low performing schools statewide.

The proposal has evolved via collaborative efforts of many people as evidenced by the letters of support from the University and middle level schools in the area. A letter of support was also submitted by the State Superintendent of Education. Partnership agreements with William J. Clark Middle School, Richland County School District One, Fairfield County School District, and the State Department of Education.

### **Summary:**

The panel compliments the authors for including the State Department of Education throughout the proposal. Although aspects of the proposal are presented in throughout the document, it lacked specificity about models they would use and accompanying data from research that support the models. The budget is heavily weighted toward salaries. The proposal stated that it featured a two pronged approach, but the two were not tied together throughout the proposal. At times the proposal was confusing and difficult to follow. For example, the focus switched from middle-level to equity about halfway through the proposal. The proposal cited the Arlington County School District Model relating to culturally relevancy but it didn't say whether this model would be used and if so, just how it fit the project.

Report Submitted by Dr. Ronald G. Joekel, Chair  
Review Panel for the EIA Centers of Excellence Proposal

### Proposal Abstracts

#### **Clemson University – Center of Excellence for Inquiry in Mathematics and Science (CEIMS) – Dr. Bob Horton**

The goals of the proposed Center of Excellence for Inquiry in Mathematics and Science (CEIMS) are to: (1) increase the number of highly qualified middle school mathematics and science teachers and (2) increase the quality, confidence, and competence of in-service middle school mathematics and science teachers through the use of content-embedded inquiry.

To accomplish the **first goal**, CEIMS will develop a new undergraduate middle school program, increase the number of teachers in the current M.A.T. program for middle grades, modify existing programs so that elementary and secondary teachers can obtain middle school certification, and design a program so that in-service teachers can add on middle school certification. To meet the **second goal**, CEIMS will offer two levels of Professional Development Institutes (PDIs) which will give in-service middle school math and science teachers extensive and intensive experiences that will increase their content knowledge and improve their pedagogical skills.

**Content-embedded inquiry** will be the focus of both the programs and the Institutes. As teachers become better equipped to implement mathematical problem-solving and scientific experimentation in their classrooms, students will learn at far deeper levels. The new instructional strategies will emphasize student engagement in learning over lecture and formula-driven strategies that dominate most middle school math and science classrooms.

Central to the efforts to support teachers' transformation to content-embedded inquiry is the innovative, yet research-driven **4E x 2 Instructional Model**. This Model unites key components of learning that include inquiry instruction (Engage, Explore, Explain, and Extend), formative assessment, and student reflection. All three components have individually been shown to improve student achievement.

The PDIs will allow teachers to experience content-embedded inquiry and then guide them as they develop, pilot, and improve **Unit and Lesson Exemplars** targeted at middle school math and science standards. Research will be conducted to monitor and improve the processes undertaken by the Center. As a result of the Center, 20 Unit Exemplars (approximately 140 days of instruction) and 360 Lesson Exemplars will be created and made available to middle school math and science teachers throughout South Carolina. These Exemplars will be stored in a web-based tool developed in conjunction with the Center; this tool will also provide support mechanisms for teachers to sustain the gains made during the PDIs.

The **partner schools**, which are fully committed to CEIMS, are Beck and Hughes Middle School Academies in Greenville County (poverty indices = 77.36 and 60.49, absolute ratings = unsatisfactory and average, respectively) and Seneca Middle School in Oconee County (poverty

index = 62.42, absolute rating = below average). Administrators from these schools will encourage active participation of their teachers as they transform their practice to one that embraces content-embedded inquiry. The teachers will also become mentors to Clemson University students enrolled in pre-service middle school teaching programs.

By the end of the five years of funding for the Center, more than 100 teachers will have become highly qualified to join the middle school math and science ranks, and more than 100 inservice teachers will have become well prepared to employ content-embedded inquiry in their classrooms.

### **University of South Carolina-Columbia – Center for Educational Equity in Mathematics and Science (CEEMS) – Dr. Gloria Boutte**

*Purpose of the Project:* The proposed Center of Educational Equity in Mathematics and Science (CEEMS) features a two-prong approach that focuses on: 1) professional development and 2) research and evaluation. Building on an existing middle level teacher education program at USC and professional development agendas that participating school districts have developed, the professional development emphasizes three strands: 1) content knowledge and instructional skills for preservice teachers; 2) professional development for inservice teachers; and 3) efforts aimed at increasing the number of certified mathematics and science teachers in South Carolina middle schools. All three strands will have a strong focus on equity issues, culturally relevant pedagogical content knowledge, and inquiry. The research and evaluation component will work collaboratively with school partners to evaluate student and teacher outcomes of the professional development and also will include a statewide needs assessment of low performing schools in the state.

*Activities to be implemented:* CEEMS' strategy will be to concentrate on four key activities during the first two years: 1) three partnerships with schools, 2) graduate and undergraduate coursework, 3) teacher recruitment and retention, and 4) needs assessment of partner schools and other low performing schools statewide. Ultimately, CEEMS seeks to facilitate the development of a vibrant learning community that is mutually beneficial to all parties (teachers, administrators, students, university faculty and preservice teachers). The intent is help schools to be able to revitalize themselves and to feel confident about future goals and directions that are sustainable. The model created with partner schools will serve as a demonstration model for other teacher education programs.

*Target Population and School Partners:* CEEMS will initially work with teachers and administrators in Fairfield, Orangeburg 5, and Richland 1 school districts to develop a coherent model for professional development. Beginning with the third year of funding, CEEMS will scale up to include 12 target schools in 10 districts that meet CHE's qualifications for low performing schools. Districts include Richland 1, Richland 2, Dorchester 4, Greenville, Aiken, Lexington 1, Lexington 4, Clarendon, Spartanburg 2, and Colleton County. With additional external funding, collaborative planning and activities will expand in the following years to reach other high need districts across the state.

*Expected Outcomes:* Quantitative and qualitative measures will be used for formative and summative evaluation of the project. The outcomes expected from CEEMS's work include strengthening the preparation of Middle Level mathematics and science preservice teachers, raising the level of competence of middle level mathematics and science teachers and their ability to implement culturally responsive teaching strategies, increasing student achievement, developing a state model of a school-university partnership that includes at least one middle school, and contributing to the research-base on effective middle level mathematics and science education in diverse settings.

**University of South Carolina-Upstate – Center of Excellence in Mathematics and Science Teaching at the Middle Level (CE-MAST) – Dr. Judy Beck**

*Purpose of the project:* The University of South Carolina Upstate and Sumter County School District 2 (SCSD2) will collaborate to improve math and science teaching in the middle grades through the establishment of the Center for Excellence in Mathematics and Science Teaching at the Middle Level (CE-MAST). CE-MAST will serve as a 'state-of-the-art' resource center for the improvement of Middle Level Mathematics and Science Instruction. CE-MAST will develop and model state-of-the-art teacher education programs, conduct research related to effective math and science instruction and position itself as a leader in the state through the dissemination of information to benefit others involved in middle level teacher education.

*Activities to be implemented:* CE-MAST will conduct in-service workshops in content and pedagogy, create and implement pre-service, undergraduate standards-based content and methods courses, and offer necessary coursework for add-on middle grades certification. A research agenda will be implemented which focuses on effective instruction and student achievement. This research will be shared with the Middle Grades Education community at state and national conferences as well as through the CE-MAST website.

*Target population:* The target population for this project will be the teachers and students of Sumter 2 School District. We will specifically target the low-performing schools identified by the CHE 2005 Report Card Rating and Poverty Index for South Carolina Middle Schools. Pre-service teachers at USC Upstate will also be served. Through the dissemination plan, middle level educators, students, and higher education faculty will benefit from this project.

*Expected outcomes:* As a result of these activities, middle level teachers in Sumter will become more effective in math and science instruction middle grades students will achieve at a higher level in math and science, pre-service education of middle level teachers will be improved, the number of middle level certified teachers will increase, and CE-MAST will become a leader in the state in Middle Grades math and science instruction.

*School and/or district partners:* CE-MAST will partner with Sumter 2 School District for this project as well as Greenville Technical College and the Center of Excellence for Educational Technology (CEET) at USC Aiken.

# Attachment 4

## Continuing Centers of Excellence

| Center Name  | Project PI                             | Institution                             | Address                | 2004 – 2005 | 2005 – 2006 | 2006 – 2007 | 2007-08   | 2008-09   | Year of Funding  |
|--|--|---|------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-----------|-----------|--|
| Center of Excellence to Prepare Teachers of Children of Poverty                | Dr. Tammy Pawloski                     | Francis Marion University               | School of Education    | \$150,000   | \$135,000   | \$110,333   | \$110,333 | \$103,014 | Yr 5 (of 5)  |
| Center of Excellence in Collaborative Learning                                 | Ms. Melanie Pulaski                    | University of South Carolina - Beaufort | USCB/JCS D Partnership | \$133,567   | \$120,210   | \$98,246    | \$98,246  | \$91,729  | Yr 5 (of 5)  |
| Center of Excellence for Adolescent Literacy and Learning                      | Dr. Victoria Ridgeway                  | Clemson University                      | School of Education    |             |             |             |           |           |  |
| Center of Excellence for the Advancement of New Literacies in Middle Grades    | Dr. Paula Egelson and Dr. Mary Provost | College of Charleston                   | School of Education    |             | \$149,978   | \$132,381   | \$112,484 | \$105,023 | Yr 4 (of 5)  |
| Center of Excellence in Middle-level Interdisciplinary Strategies for Teaching | Dr. Gary Senn                          | University of South Carolina - Aiken    | School of Education    |             |             | \$147,111   | \$132,400 | \$123,617 | Yr 3 (of 5)  |
|  |  |   |                        |             |             |             |           |           | Yr 1 (of 5)  |
|  |  |   |                        |             |             |             |           |           | (recommended for funding in 2007-08, but delayed because of availability of funds) |
|  |  |   |                        |             |             |             |           | \$142,800 |  |

South Carolina Commission on Higher Education  
Proposal Review Rubric/Rating Form  
Centers of Excellence Program FY 2008-09

**Please use one Proposal Review Rubric/Rating Form for each proposal.**

Proposal Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Submitting Institution: \_\_\_\_\_

Project Director: \_\_\_\_\_

**SECTION I: General Characteristics of a Center –**

| <i>Does the proposed Center demonstrate the following?</i>  | <i>Number of<br/>Points<br/>Possible</i> | <i>Number of<br/>Points<br/>Awarded</i> |
|---|--|---|
| 1. A clearly defined focus of related scholarly and educational activities related to the needs of low-performing schools.      | 10                                       |   |
| <i>Comments:</i>  |  |   |
| 2. Activities that support existing programs at the institution.  | 5  |   |
| <i>Comments:</i>  |  |   |
| 3. Clearly defined benefits to the host institution as well as its K-12 partner(s)  | 5  |   |
| <i>Comments:</i>  |  |   |
| 4. An institutional commitment as indicated by administrative support, budget, facilities, equipment, special initiatives, etc. | 5  |   |
| <i>Comments:</i>  |  |   |
| 5. A likelihood of having a lasting positive impact on the K-12 partner(s).   | 10                                       |   |
| <i>Comments:</i>  |  |   |
| 6. Activities based on proven innovative practices that enable school   | 10                                       |   |



personnel to help all students achieve.

*Comments:*

## **SECTION II: Technical Merits of the Proposal**

| <i><b>Does the proposal include the following?</b></i>   | <i><b>Number of<br/>Points<br/>Possible</b></i> | <i><b>Number of<br/>Points<br/>Awarded</b></i> |
|--|---|--|
| 1. The area to be targeted has been identified in the <i>Guidelines</i> as a priority area for funding.  | 5   |  |
| <i>Comments:</i>   |   |  |
| 2. Programs and activities are designed in collaboration with a K-12 partner(s) that has been identified in the <i>Guidelines</i> as low-performing.   | 5   |  |
| <i>Comments:</i>   |   |  |
| 3. The activities are well planned and meaningful.   | 5   |  |
| <i>Comments:</i>   |   |  |
| 4. The outcomes are realistic and likely to be obtained.   | 5   |  |
| <i>Comments:</i>   |   |  |
| 5. The evaluation plan is based on measurable criteria and addresses the effectiveness of the center. An external evaluator is included.   | 10  |  |
| <i>Comments:</i>   |   |  |
| 6. The budgets, both grants and external match, are justified.   | 10  |  |
| <i>Comments:</i>   |   |  |
| 7. The institutional strength and capacity to implement the Center are substantial as indicated by faculty and programmatic quality, previous collaborative endeavors with education stakeholders in related program areas, etc. | 5   |  |
| <i>Comments:</i>   |   |  |

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 8. Programs and activities are designed in collaboration with other Centers of Excellence and/or Teacher Recruitment Centers in all appropriate related activities. | 5 |
|---|---|

*Comments:*

### **SECTION III: Specific Criteria of a Center**

| <i>Does the proposal include discussion of the following?</i>   | <i>Number of<br/>Points<br/>Possible</i> | <i>Number of<br/>Points<br/>Awarded</i> |
|---|--|---|
| 1. Involves substantial public school-college cooperation/collaboration.  | 5  |   |
| <i>Comments:</i>  |  |   |
| 2. Involves other parties affected by the Center's programs, including other divisions of the institution, other institutions of higher education, professional associations, parents, private sector, etc. | 5  |   |
| <i>Comments:</i>  |  |   |
| 3. State funds are matched with external or internal funds (including in-kind) and show an increasing commitment of these additional resources in subsequent years.   | 5  |   |
| <i>Comments:</i>  |  |   |
| 4. Describes expected benefits to pre-service teacher education.  | 5  |   |
| <i>Comments:</i>  |  |   |
| 5. Describes the proposed Center Director's qualifications as well as other faculty/support staff who will work with the Center.  | 5  |   |
| <i>Comments:</i>  |  |   |
| 6. Proposed professional development activities are in alignment with S. C. Professional Development Standards.   | 5  |   |
| <i>Comments:</i>  |  |   |
| 7. Demonstrates the institution's commitment to model as well as develop state-of-the art programs by changing its ongoing academic program as a result of the Center's work.                               | 5  |   |

*Does the proposal include discussion of the following?*

*Number of  
Points  
Possible*

*Number of  
Points  
Awarded*

*Comments:*

8. The proposal has a clear plan for achievement which will lead to success of the proposed goals and objectives.

10

*Comments:*

9. The proposed program is consistent with ongoing curriculum, assessment, teacher preparation, or professional development activities in the State.

5

*Comments:*

|                        |  |     |  |
|------------------------|--|-----|--|
| TOTAL NUMBER OF POINTS |  | 150 |  |
|------------------------|--|-----|--|

**Additional comments/recommendations:**

| Proposal Element  | Possible Ratings                                    | Rating given |
|---|---|--------------|
| What is the potential of this proposal to substantially improve the quality of performance of the participants it serves and help students achieve? | Superior / Excellent /<br>Good / Fair / Poor        |              |
| <i>Comments:</i>  |   |              |
|   |   |              |
| (To be completed after reviewing all proposals.)<br>How would you rate this proposal overall as compared to the others you have reviewed?           | Superior / Excellent /<br>Good / Fair / Poor        |              |
| <i>Comments:</i>  |   |              |
|   |   |              |
| Would you recommend funding this proposal?  | Yes<br>Yes, with reservations<br>Probably not<br>No |              |
| <i>Comments:</i>  |   |              |
|   |   |              |

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS**

|  |
|--|
|  |
|--|

Reviewer \_\_\_\_\_

**EIA CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE  
PROPOSAL REVIEW PANEL  
MARCH 7, 2009  
8:30 am – 3:00 pm  
CHE Conference Room**

|                  |   |
|------------------|---|
| 8:30 – 9:15 a.m. | Coffee, Snacks and Introductions<br>Review Agenda<br>Overview of Centers of Excellence Criteria and Review Procedures |
| *9:30 – 10:30    | University of South Carolina- Columbia Proposal Presentation  |
| *10:30 – 11:30   | University of South Carolina - Upstate Proposal Presentation  |
| *11:30 – 12:30   | Clemson University Proposal Presentation  |
| *12:30 – 1:30    | Lunch   |
| 1:30 – 2:30      | Panel discusses each proposal<br>Panel determines the 08-09 Center of Excellence                                      |
| 2:30 p.m.        | Completion of travel forms/collection of materials  |
| 3:00 pm          | Meeting adjourns  |

\* Institutional representative will be invited to present individually

**Thank you for sharing your expertise in Middle School Content, your contribution to the discussion and your thoughtful decision.**